

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

---

JOHN DOE 1, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 13-14356

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER REQUIRING PARTIES TO MEET AND CONFER**

On December 20, 2013, Plaintiffs filed a "Motion for Protective Order." [Dkt. # 28] On the same day, Defendants filed a "Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Motion for More Definite Statement." [Dkt. # 31] Neither motion contained the statement required by Local Rule 7.1(a)(2) explaining how concurrence was sought and whether it was obtained. In an apparent attempt to remedy this fault, Plaintiffs filed a rule 7.1(a) statement three days after their motion was filed. [Dkt. # 32] Because concurrence was not sought by either party *prior to* filing their respective motions, the court struck both motions from the docket. It does not appear to the court that the parties are meeting and conferring in a good faith effort to obtain concurrence for their respective requests for relief. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that lead counsel for the parties (*i.e.*, trial counsel) are DIRECTED to meet and confer in person by **January 10, 2014**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties will file a joint statement by **January**

**17, 2014** explaining their efforts to resolve the issues implicated by the now-terminated motions.

s/Robert H. Cleland  
ROBERT H. CLELAND  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: December 31, 2013

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, December 31, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa Wagner  
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk  
(313) 234-5522